



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,751	03/30/2004	Peter E. Hart	20412-08384	7233

76137 7590 07/24/2008
RICOH/FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, JAMES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/24/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOC@FENWICK.COM
aprice@fenwick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/814,751	Applicant(s) HART ET AL.	
	Examiner James A. Thompson	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Jan 2008, 11 Apr 2008, 30 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/23/08, 4/11/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 30 May 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are directed to the present amendments to the claims. Thus, Applicant's arguments are fully addressed by the new grounds of rejection set forth below. Since the new grounds of rejection have been necessitated by Applicant's present amendments to the claims, the present action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11, 13-15, 22, 28-37, 39-40, 43-47 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723) and Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1).**

Regarding claims 1 and 30: Sugiyama discloses a system for printing multi-media data (figure 1 and column 3, lines 11-20 of Sugiyama), the system comprising: a network including a printing system and a network device (as can be determined from figure 1 of Sugiyama – *A video signal is received by the video printer from an external device. This constitutes a network. The printing system is the printer portion (30-33) of the video printer. The network device is the external device not shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama, but is used to obtain the video signal input.*); a network interface (figure 1(11) of Sugiyama) for receiving multimedia data from the network device (column 3, lines 11-17 of Sugiyama); a media processing system (figure 1(15) of Sugiyama) coupled to the network interface (as can be seen in figure 1 of Sugiyama) to receive the multimedia data (column 3, lines 26-29 of Sugiyama), the media processing system determining a printed representation of the multimedia data and an electronic representation of the time-based multimedia data (column 4, lines 24-42 of Sugiyama); a printed output system (figure 1(30-33) of Sugiyama) coupled to the multimedia processing system (as can be seen in figure 1 of Sugiyama) to receive the printed representation, the printed output system producing a corresponding printed output from the printed representation of the multimedia data (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama); an electronic output system (figure 1(18-20) of Sugiyama) coupled to the multimedia processing system (as can be seen

Art Unit: 2625

in figure 1 of Sugiyama) to receive the electronic representation, the electronic output system producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the multimedia data (column 4, lines 24-35 of Sugiyama); and a peripheral interface (figure 1(17) of Sugiyama) coupled to the multimedia processing system to communicate with a peripheral device (column 3, lines 29-41 and column 4, lines 24-29 of Sugiyama – *communicates with monitor and printer, both of which are considered peripheral devices*).

Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the media processing system automatically detects coupling of the peripheral device, resides at least in part on the printing system and at least in part on the network device, and comprises an embedded multimedia server.

Chiloyan discloses a digital data processing system which automatically detects coupling of a peripheral device (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Chiloyan) and comprises an embedded server (para. 59 of Chiloyan – *embedded in vehicle, can act as server through Internet connection*). Chiloyan further teaches performing parallel processing of the image data (para. 31, lines 1-6 and lines 23-28 of Chiloyan), and thus processing image data at least in part on one system and at least in part on a second system.

Sugiyama is analogous art with respect to Chiloyan since they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the processing, control and rendering of digital image data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform processing of the received video image data in parallel on both the printing system and the network device. Thus, the media processing system as a whole would reside at least in part on the printing system and at least in part on the network device. The motivation for doing so would have been that splitting up the video image data processing onto multiple processors increases the speed with which a user can obtain processed image data. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an embedded server and the automatic detection of peripheral devices. Both features are well-known features that are readily implemented and provide predictable results. An embedded processor allows for a wide range of applications, such as in an automobile or other environment, rather than having to use a general purpose computer to perform the specialized processing. Further, automatic detection of the coupling of a peripheral device relieves the burden of having to manually install a peripheral device and improves the ease-of-use of the device for the end user, especially an end user who wishes to simply use the device rather than be bothered with many small technical details. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chiloyan with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 30.

Further regarding claim 30: The system of claim 1 performs the method of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2625

Further regarding claim 2: Chiloyan discloses that the network device is a personal computer (para. 31, lines 6-9 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 4: Chiloyan discloses a remote external service system coupled to the network (figure 1(49) of Chiloyan), the external service system in communication with the media processing system for performing at least some processing steps for the media data (para. 31, lines 23-28 and para. 34, lines 1-13 – *multi-media as per combination with Sugiyama*).

Further regarding claim 6: Chiloyan discloses that the peripheral interface comprises a removable media storage reader (figure 1(29) and para. 32, lines 28-30 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 7: Chiloyan discloses that the peripheral interface comprises a media input device selected from a group consisting of: a DVD reader, a video cassette tape reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, and a flash card reader (para. 32, lines 30-34 of Chiloyan – *an audio cassette tape and a video cassette tape are both types of magnetic cassettes; language of para. 32 of Chiloyan demonstrates that all types of magnetic cassettes fall under Chiloyan's disclosure; language of para. 32, lines 30-37 of Chiloyan also demonstrates that any combination of the listed peripheral devices is possible, and thus having the group consist only of the five listed devices is one of many possibilities of Chiloyan's disclosure*).

Further regarding claim 8: Chiloyan discloses that that the external source is a media broadcaster, and wherein the peripheral interface comprises a media broadcast receiver that can be tuned to a media broadcast (para. 31, lines 12-19 of Chiloyan – *TV set-top box is a media broadcast receiver that can be tuned to a media broadcast, the media broadcast being the external source*).

Regarding claim 11: Sugiyama discloses that the network device comprises screen capture hardware (figure 1(12) and column 3, lines 12-16 and lines 20-24 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 13: Sugiyama discloses that the network device comprises a video recorder (figure 1(11) of Sugiyama), wherein the external source of media (figure 1(“Video Signal”) of Sugiyama) is a series of images captured by the video recorder, converted into an electronic format (column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama), and then provided to the media processing system (column 3, lines 16-20 of Sugiyama).

Further regarding claim 14: Chiloyan discloses that the network device comprises an audio recorder (para. 32, lines 30-33 of Chiloyan – *an audio cassette tape (which has a corresponding recorder) is a type of magnetic cassette; language of para. 32 of Chiloyan demonstrates that all types of magnetic cassettes fall under Chiloyan's disclosure*), wherein the external source of media is a series of sounds that are converted into an electrical format by the audio recorder and then provided to the media

Art Unit: 2625

processing system (*inherent in the function of an audio recorder since, as is abundantly well-known in the art, an electronic audio recorder operates by converting a series of sounds into an electrical format, which would then be provided to the media processing system to which the recorder is connected*).

Further regarding claim 15: Chiloyan discloses that the electronic output system is configured to write the electronic representation (digital data files) to a removable media storage device (figure 1(29) and para. 32, lines 28-30 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 22: Chiloyan discloses that the electronic output system comprises a web page display (para. 31, lines 1-6 of Chiloyan).

Regarding claim 28: Sugiyama discloses that the network device includes a user interface that provides information to a user about at least one of the printed representation and the electronic representation of the multimedia data (column 3, lines 45-48 of Sugiyama), the user interface further accepting input from a user to cause the media processing system to modify at least one of the printed representation and the electronic representation of the multimedia data (column 3, lines 57-61 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 29: Sugiyama discloses that the media processing system determines at least one of the printed representation and the electronic representation (column 4, lines 24-42 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said determination is with assistance from a networked computing device.

Chiloyan discloses performing image processing over a plurality of processors (para. 31, lines 23-28 of Chiloyan).

Sugiyama is analogous art with respect to Chiloyan since they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the processing of digital image data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform processing (determination) of the printed and/or electronic representations with assistance from a networked (parallel) computing device. The motivation for doing so would have been that splitting up the video image data processing onto multiple processors increases the speed with which a user can obtain processed image data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chiloyan with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 29.

Further regarding claim 31: Chiloyan discloses that the electronic output is stored on a media recorder (figure 1(29) and para. 32, lines 28-30 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 32: Chiloyan discloses that the electronic output is stored on a removable storage device (para. 32, lines 28-30 of Chiloyan).

Art Unit: 2625

Further regarding claim 33: Chiloyan discloses that the removable storage device is a DVD (para. 32, lines 30-34 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 34: Chiloyan discloses that the removable storage device is a CD-ROM (figure 1(31) and para. 32, lines 19-21 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 35: Chiloyan discloses that the removable storage device is an audio cassette tape (para. 32, lines 30-33 of Chiloyan – *an audio cassette tape is a type of magnetic cassette; language of para. 32 of Chiloyan demonstrates that all types of magnetic cassettes fall under Chiloyan's disclosure*).

Further regarding claim 36: Chiloyan discloses that the removable storage device is a video tape (para. 32, lines 30-33 of Chiloyan – *a video tape is a type of magnetic cassette; language of para. 32 of Chiloyan demonstrates that all types of magnetic cassettes fall under Chiloyan's disclosure*).

Further regarding claim 37: Chiloyan discloses that the removable storage device is a flash card (para. 32, lines 30-33 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 39: Chiloyan discloses that the removable storage device is a computer disk (figure 1(29) and para. 32, lines 28-30 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 40: Chiloyan discloses that the network device includes a cellular telephone (para. 31, lines 12-17 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 43: Chiloyan discloses that the network device includes a DVD reader (figure 1(30) and para. 32, lines 15-21 and lines 30-34 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 44: Chiloyan discloses that the network device includes a video cassette tape reader (para. 32, lines 30-33 of Chiloyan – *a video cassette tape is a type of magnetic cassette; language of para. 32 of Chiloyan demonstrates that all types of magnetic cassettes fall under Chiloyan's disclosure*).

Further regarding claim 45: Chiloyan discloses that the network device includes a CD reader (figure 1(30) and para. 32, lines 19-21 of Chiloyan).

Further regarding claim 46: Chiloyan discloses that the network device includes an audio cassette tape reader (para. 32, lines 30-33 of Chiloyan – *an audio cassette tape is a type of magnetic cassette; language of para. 32 of Chiloyan demonstrates that all types of magnetic cassettes fall under Chiloyan's disclosure*).

Further regarding claim 47: Chiloyan discloses that the network device includes a flash card reader (para. 32, lines 30-33 of Chiloyan).

Regarding claim 49: Sugiyama discloses that the network device includes a video capture device (column 3, lines 11-16 of Sugiyama).

4. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Chang (US-6,167,033).

Regarding claim 3: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the network is a local area network,

Chang discloses transmitting digital data packets over a local area network (figure 5; column 1, lines 13-16; and column 6, lines 29-39 of Chang).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Chang since they are from similar problem solving areas, namely how to efficiently transmit digital image/video data between a plurality of different computational devices. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically use a local area network as the network. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a local area network is a common type of network for connecting a plurality of digital computational devices that are located physically close to each other. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chang with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Further regarding claim 5: Chang discloses that the external service system (taught by Sugiyama and corresponding to an external system discussed by Chang) is coupled to the network by the Internet (column 1, lines 39-50 of Chang).

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), Stevens (US-2002/0010641 A1), Hymel (US-2003/0220988 A1), and McCarthy (US-6,296,693 B1).

Regarding claim 9: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the peripheral interface comprises an embedded receiver selected from a group consisting of: an embedded TV receiver, an embedded radio receiver, an embedded short-wave radio receiver, an embedded satellite radio receiver, an embedded two-way radio, and an embedded cellular phone.

Stevens discloses an embedded TV receiver (figure 3(110) and para. 36, lines 1-8 of Stevens), an embedded radio receiver (para. 36, lines 1-8 of Stevens), and an embedded satellite radio receiver (para. 36, lines 1-8 of Stevens) available for selection by a user (para. 36, lines 6-10 of Stevens).

Art Unit: 2625

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Stevens because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have an embedded TV receiver, an embedded radio receiver, and an embedded satellite radio receiver available for selection at the peripheral interface, as taught by Stevens. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to retrieve desired distributions of audio and video data over a controlled broadcast (para. 4, lines 1-5 of Stevens). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stevens with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan.

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan and Stevens does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only an embedded TV receiver, an embedded radio receiver, and an embedded satellite radio receiver, but also an embedded short-wave radio receiver, an embedded two-way radio, and an embedded cellular phone.

Hymel discloses a cellular phone as an input device (para. 10, lines 14-15 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan and Stevens is analogous art with respect to Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the cellular phone taught by Hymel embedded and selectable, as taught by Stevens. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan and Stevens.

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan, Stevens and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only an embedded TV receiver, an embedded radio receiver, an embedded satellite radio receiver, and an embedded cellular phone, but also an embedded short-wave radio receiver, and an embedded two-way radio.

McCarthy discloses including a two-way (CB) radio (column 7, lines 13-16 and lines 21-23 of McCarthy) and a radio receiver for receiving short wave radio signals (column 7, lines 13-16 and lines 21-23 of McCarthy).

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan, Stevens and Hymel is combinable with McCarthy because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data communication hardware. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the two-way radio and the short-wave radio taught by McCarthy in the group of selectable

Art Unit: 2625

embedded receivers. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with means of personal communication. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine McCarthy with the combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan, Stevens and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), Federspiel (US-5,170,935), Baron (US-5,940,776), and McCarthy (US-6,296,693 B1).

Regarding claim 10: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the network device comprises an embedded receiver selected from a group consisting of an embedded heat sensor, an embedded humidity sensor, an embedded National Weather Service radio alert receiver, and an embedded TV Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) alert monitor.

Federspiel discloses selecting between an embedded heat sensor (column 12, lines 10-18 of Federspiel) and an embedded humidity sensor (column 12, lines 21-24 of Federspiel).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Federspiel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control and processing of digital time-based data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to select from among an embedded heat sensor and an embedded humidity sensor, as taught by Federspiel. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to control the environmental conditions in which a user is present (column 2, lines 5-9 of Federspiel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Federspiel with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan.

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan and Federspiel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of an embedded heat sensor and an embedded humidity sensor, but also of an embedded National Weather Service radio alert receiver, and an embedded TV Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) alert monitor.

Baron discloses an embedded National Weather Service radio alert receiver (column 5, lines 45-49 and lines 61-65 of Baron).

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan and Federspiel is analogous art with respect to Baron because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control and processing of digital time-based data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the embedded National Weather Service radio alert receiver taught by Baron in the group of receivers from which a user can select. The motivation for doing so would have been so that a user can stay informed about the latest weather conditions and possible weather emergencies (column 1, lines 23-

Art Unit: 2625

31 of Baron). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Baron with the combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan and Federspiel.

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan, Federspiel and Baron does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of an embedded heat sensor, an embedded humidity sensor, and an embedded National Weather Service radio alert receiver, but also of an embedded TV Emergency Broadcast System (EAS) alert monitor.

McCarthy discloses an embedded TV Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) alert monitor (column 7, lines 13-16 and lines 18-21 of McCarthy).

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan, Federspiel and Baron is analogous art with respect to McCarthy because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control and processing of digital time-based data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the embedded TV Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) alert monitor taught by McCarthy in the group of receivers from which a user can select. The motivation for doing so would have been to keep the user alerted to any emergency conditions (column 7, lines 15-18 of McCarthy). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine McCarthy with the combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan, Federspiel and Baron to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

7. Claims 12 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Chino (US-6,118,888).

Regarding claim 12: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the network device comprises an ultrasonic pen capture device.

Chino discloses an ultrasonic pen capture device (figure 3(102i) and column 7, lines 14-16 of Chino).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of digital data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to capture input data using an ultrasonic pen capture device, as taught by Chino. The suggestion for doing so would have been that an electronic pen is simply another useful output device that provides digital data a user may wish to obtain (figure 3 and column 6, lines 66-67 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Regarding claim 26: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the media processing system comprises an audio sound localization module.

Art Unit: 2625

Chino discloses an audio sound localization module (column 13, lines 5-14 of Chino - *by using the gaze object detection portion of the multi-modal interface apparatus, the audio sound localization is determined*).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the audio sound localization module taught by Chino as part of the overall media processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that user input is intended, and the user is not speaking to someone else (column 1, lines 52-58 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 26.

Regarding claim 27: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the media processing system comprises a video motion detection module.

Chino discloses an embedded video motion detection module (figure 3(102f) and column 7, lines 33-38 of Chino).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is combinable with Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the video motion detection module taught by Chino as part of the overall media processing system. The suggestion for doing so would have been that detection of a user's motion and gestures is simply another useful electronic means to input data into a computerized system (figure 3 and column 7, lines 2-11 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Gerber (US-5,568,406).

Further regarding claim 16: Chiloyan discloses that the removable storage device is selected from a group consisting of a DVD, a video cassette tape, a CD, an audio cassette tape, a flash card, a computer disk, and a computer-readable medium (para. 32, lines 30-37 of Chiloyan - *an audio cassette tape and a video cassette tape are both types of magnetic cassettes; language of para. 32 of Chiloyan demonstrates that all types of magnetic cassettes fall under Chiloyan's disclosure*).

Art Unit: 2625

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the group consists not only of a DVD, a video cassette tape, a CD, an audio cassette tape, a computer disk, a computer-readable medium, and a flash card, but also an SD disk.

Gerber discloses storing digital data on an SD disk (column 10, lines 28-34 of Gerber).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is combinable with Gerber because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection an SD disk. The motivation for doing so would have been that an SD disk is useful for backing up large amounts of digital data (column 10, lines 23-34 of Gerber). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gerber with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Kimura (US-5,270,989).

Regarding claim 17: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the electronic output system comprises a handling mechanism to accommodate a plurality of removable storage devices.

Kimura discloses a handling mechanism (figure 1(6) of Kimura) that accommodates a plurality of removable storage devices (column 4, lines 46-52 of Kimura).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Kimura because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely processing and storing digital output data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide a handling mechanism to handle a plurality of removable storage devices, as taught by Kimura. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to store and select from among a plurality of different available removable storage devices (column 2, lines 38-42 of Kimura). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kimura with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Art Unit: 2625

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), Kimura (US-5,270,989), Takemasa (US-5,136,563), and Morinaga (US-4,734,898).

Regarding claim 18: The arguments regarding claim 17 are incorporated herein. Kimura further discloses selecting between handling devices (such as Laser Disc or CD) (column 5, lines 23-30 of Kimura). Both handling devices are of the tray type (column 5, lines 20-27 of Kimura).

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan and Kimura does not disclose expressly that the group of handling mechanism from which the handling mechanism is selected consists not only of a tray, but also of a feeder and a bandolier.

Takemasa discloses a feeder type handling mechanism (figure 2b; figure 18; and column 5, lines 52-67 of Takemasa).

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan and Kimura is analogous art with respect to Takemasa because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely processing and storing digital output data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the feeder type handling mechanism taught by Takemasa as another type of handling mechanism from which to choose. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide for compact and reliable insertion and switching of the removable storage devices (column 2, lines 14-16 of Takemasa). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Takemasa with the combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan and Kimura.

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan, Kimura and Takemasa does not disclose expressly that said group of handling mechanism from which the handling mechanism is selected consists not only of a feeder and a tray, but also of a bandolier.

Morinaga discloses a bandolier type handling mechanism (figure 3a and column 4, lines 53-62 of Morinaga).

The combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan, Kimura and Takemasa is analogous art with respect to Morinaga because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely processing and storing digital output data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the bandolier type handling mechanism taught by Morinaga as another type of handling mechanism from which to choose. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to store even more removable storage devices that with the tray or feeder type handling mechanisms while preventing damage to the removable storage devices (column 2, lines 14-24 of Morinaga). Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2625

been obvious to combine Morinaga with the combination of Sugiyama, Chiloyan, Kimura and Takemasa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

11. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Steinberg (US-6,000,030).

Regarding claim 19: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that said electronic output system comprises a media writer selected from a group consisting of a disposable media writer and a self-destructing media writer.

Steinberg discloses a disposable media writer (column 4, lines 16-20 of Steinberg) and a self-destructing media writer (column 5, lines 28-36 of Steinberg).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Steinberg because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control and storage of digital data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide for digital data output a group of media writers consisting of a disposable media writer and a self-destructing media writer, as taught by Steinberg. The motivation for doing so would have been prevent unauthorized access to computer files (column 1, lines 43-50 of Steinberg). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Steinberg with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

12. Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Korman (US-6,308,887 B1).

Regarding claim 20: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the electronic output system is coupled to a speaker system and sends an audio signal to the speaker system.

Korman discloses outputting audio data using a speaker system as a peripheral device (figure 2 (310) and column 7, lines 47-54 of Korman – *In order for said speaker system to operate as an output, sending an audio signal to said speaker system is inherent*).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Korman because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to output audio data to a connected speaker system, as taught by Korman. The motivation for doing so would have been

Art Unit: 2625

to provide the appropriate output format if audio output is desired. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Korman with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

Further regarding claim 21: Korman discloses that the electronic output system comprises an embedded sound player for generating the audio signal (column 5, lines 30-34 of Korman).

13. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Stevens (US-2002/0010641 A1).

Regarding claims 24 and 25: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the media processing system comprises an audio encryption module and a video encryption module.

Stevens discloses an audio encryption module (para. 54, lines 1-4 and para. 57, lines 3-4 of Stevens) and a video encryption module (para. 54, lines 1-4 of Stevens).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Stevens because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the audio encryption module and the video encryption module taught by Stevens as part of said multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to retrieve desired distributions of audio and video data over a controlled broadcast (para. 4, lines 1-5 of Stevens). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stevens with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claims 24 and 25.

14. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Shieh (US-2002/0185533 A1).

Regarding claim 38: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the removable storage device is a memory stick.

Shieh discloses removable storage devices including a memory stick (para. 18, lines 9-10 of Shieh).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for

Art Unit: 2625

selection a flash card and a memory stick, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to output data to one of a plurality of different output devices, depending upon user need and desire (para. 18, lines 3-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

15. Claims 41-42 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Hymel (US-2003/0220988 A1).

Regarding claim 41: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the network device includes a video camcorder.

Hymel discloses a video camcorder as a network device (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 20 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the video camcorder taught by Hymel as a network device. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 41.

Regarding claim 42: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the network device includes a digital audio recorder.

Hymel discloses a digital audio recorder (MP3 player) as a network device (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the digital audio recorder taught by Hymel as a network device. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 42.

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claim 48: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the network device includes a digital video recorder.

Hymel discloses a digital video recorder as a network device (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19 of Hymel).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is analogous art with respect to Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the flash card reader taught by Hymel as a network device. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 48.

16. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US-5,633,723), Chiloyan (US-2002/0095501 A1), and Heilweil (US-4,881,135).

Regarding claim 50: The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan does not disclose expressly that the network device includes a meeting recorder.

Heilweil discloses media input using a meeting recorder (figure 2 and column 3, lines 48-51 of Heilweil).

The combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan is combinable with Heilweil because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of multimedia data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the meeting recorder taught by Heilweil as a network device. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide audio-visual data regarding a conference or a meeting in a concealed or discreet manner (column 2, lines 33-40 of Heilweil). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Heilweil with the combination of Sugiyama and Chiloyan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 50.

Art Unit: 2625

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is (571)272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Edward L. Coles/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/James A Thompson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

17 July 2008